REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14 and 16-29 are pending and under consideration. Claims 2 and 15 are cancelled.

ALLOWED CLAIMS

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication that claims 1, 3, 4, 6-14 and 16-20 are allowed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,032 to Bateman et al (hereinafter "Bateman") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097339 to Funck et al. ("Funck").

Independent claim 21 patentably distinguishes over Bateman and Funck at least by reciting:

- formatting a portion of the customer data to create a customer data document based on an agent security level, the agent security level identifying types of information within the customer data to which a call answering agent is permitted access; and
- providing the call answering agent with the customer data document through an agent workstation.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the whole context of the method recited in claim 21 which is critical for alleviating a problem that Bateman's and Funk's systems are not capable to alleviate.

When an automatic call distribution is performed in a call center, calls from customers are processed by an agent of the call center. The agent accesses customer data database in order to individually respond to the customer's call. Customer data usually includes information about business connections of the company with the calling customer. Agents thus have direct full access to a company's database including internal data which a company may desire to protect. In order to limit access but to provide the necessary information to the agent, the present method provides the agent with a customer data document prepared according to the security level of the agent. As recited in claim 21, the call answering agent receives the customer data document **through** an agent workstation, and, thus, the agent does not have access directly to the customer database.

Bateman discloses a system for coordinating communications using a call center for

setting up an outbound call by a call center. Bateman implements a call-back feature, such that the customer sends contact information to the call center and, subsequently, is called back by an agent of the call center. The agent and the customer share only the callback number and have the ability to view the same multimedia screen which prompted the customer's question (see Col. 6 lines 57-58 of Bateman). However, this information is not a customer data document created in view of the call. Bateman merely provides potential customers viewing vendor's webpage with the possibility to enter a number at which to be called by an agent of the vendor for further interaction based on the vendor's webpage. Customer's information (e.g. the phone number) is not stored and extracted from a database.

Funck discloses a method of transmitting customer data from a customer computer to a vendor in connection with an ongoing purchase (see e.g. paragraph [0026] of Funck). The paradigm of this communication is fundamentally different from managing data in an automatic call distribution in a call center. The customer's computer provides different vendors information depending on the trustworthyness of the vendor (see paragraph's [0031]-[0033] of Funck). Funck does not teach or suggest that "a portion of the customer data [is formatted] to create a customer data document based on an agent security level." There is no intermediary, i.e. the information is not provided "through an agent workstation." The method recited in claim 21 ensures that an agent does not have direct unlimited access to customer data and not that vendors are selectively provided with different levels of information as in Funck.

At least for the above reasons, Bateman and Funck fail to render obvious the features recited in independent claim 21. Therefore, claim 21 and claims 22-29 depending directly or indirectly from claim 21 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/656,870

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: July 2, 2008   By: _____
                            Luminita A. Todor
                            Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

11